

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8, 10-17 and 19-26 are pending. Claims 1-8, 10-17 and 19-26 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 10, and 19 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicants submit that the amendments do not add new matter.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-8, 10-17, and 19-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicants have amended claim 1 in light of the Examiner's rejection.

Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Given that claims 2-8 depend from amended claim 1, and add additional limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-8 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Applicants have amended claim 10 in light of the Examiner's rejection.

Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 10 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Given that claims 11-17 depend from amended claim 10, and add additional limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claims 11-17 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Applicants have amended claim 19 in light of the Examiner's rejection.

Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 19 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Given that claims 20-26 depend from amended claim 19, and add additional limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claims 20-26 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-11, 13-17, 19-20, 22-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0079210 to Markstein et al. (“Markstein”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,875,318 to Langford (“Langford”). Claims 3, 12 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Markstein, in view of Langford and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,644,709 to Austin (“Austin”).

The Examiner relies on Markstein on basis of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The instant patent application was filed on January 10, 2002. Applicants submitting herewith the declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 of inventors Leonid Baraz and Tevi Devor to establish invention of the claimed subject matter of the present application prior to October 2001, which is the filing date of Markstein. The Declaration sets forth facts sufficient to show (1) conception of the invention prior to October 2001, (2) due diligence from prior October 2001 to January 10, 2002 towards constructive reduction to practice, and (3) constructive reduction to practice on January 10, 2002, which is filing date of the instant patent application no. 10/043,474.

Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that Markstein is not available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants accordingly request that Markstein be removed from consideration.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Langford alone.

Langford, in contrast, discloses a translator for translating a source code executable by a first processor to a target code executable by a second processor, and fails to disclose, teach, or suggest modifying the first program to expand a register set for a routine in the first program transparently to execution of the first program that includes adding one or more registers to the register set, wherein the one or more registers of an expanded register set are used by a second program to store data used to analyze the execution of the first program, as recited in amended claim 1.

Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Langford.

Given that claims 2, 4-8, 10-11, 13-17, 19-20, 22-26 contain similar limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 4-8, 10-11, 13-17, 19-20, 22-26 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Langford. Austin, in contrast, discloses detecting memory access errors; and similarly to Langford, Austin fails to disclose the discussed limitations of amended claim 1.

Thus, neither Langford, Austin, nor any combination thereof discloses, teaches, or suggests the invention, as claimed in amended claim 1.

Given that claims 3, 12 and 21 contain the discussed limitations, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3, 12 and 21 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Langford and further in view of Austin.

**CONCLUSION**

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 6/7/7 By: ✓  
Michael J. Mallie  
Reg.No.36,591

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025  
(408) 720-8300